Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 6-26 are pending in the application, with claims 9, 14-16, 21 and 26 being the independent claims. Claims 9, 14-16, 21 and 26 are sought to be amended.

These changes are believed to introduce no new matter and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the foregoing amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 2, 7-10, 12-17, 19-22 and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,415,316 to Van Der Meer et al. (hereinafter "Van Der Meer"). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 26 recites in part:

- (3) invoking said bookmark, thereby navigating to said first Web page;
- (4) reviewing an automatic channel form that was pre-populated with at least a URL of said second Web page, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser, said automatic channel form generated by a script in said first Web page in response to step (3); (emphasis added).

In response to Applicants arguments submitted on January 29, 2007, page 2 of the Advisory Action states:

Van Der Meer explicitly teaches and suggests throughout the patent that the automatic channel form is generated via Diary Server accessed via the Internet (see Fig. 1(b): "Request from browser").

Applicants respectfully submit that Van Der Meer describes diary applet 112 generating one or more pages of the diary in HTML and displaying the HTML as a diary page by a browser (see Van Der Meer at col. 9, lines 7-10). However, Van Der Meer fails to describe the step of generating the diary page in response to invoking a bookmark. Generating and displaying diary web pages is not the same as the steps of invoking a bookmark to navigate to a webpage thereby causing a script in the webpage to generate an automatic channel form. Thus Van Der Meer fails to teach or suggest "said automatic channel form generated by a script in said first Web page in response to step (3)" as recited in independent claim 26.

Furthermore claim 26, as amended, recites in part:

wherein a channel is a collection of one or more web pages the content of which is transferred to a mobile device during synchronization with a server; and wherein the content of the channel is accessible on the mobile device when the mobile device is connected and is not connected to the internet.

Applicants respectfully submit that Van Der Meer is fundamentally different than the presently claimed embodiments since Van Der Meer teaches a method and apparatus to create an *online diary* containing multimedia references to contents of Websites (*see* Abstract of Van Der Meer). The online diary as described by Van Der Meer is accessible only via the internet and cannot be transferred to a mobile device for offline viewing. Van Der Meer fails to teach a channel that is a collection of objects transferable to a *mobile device during synchronization with a server* such that content of

the channel is accessible when the mobile device is connected and is not connected to the internet. Thus Van Der Meer fails to teach "wherein a channel is a collection of one or more web pages the content of which is transferred to a mobile device during synchronization with a server; and wherein the content of the channel is accessible on the mobile device when the mobile device is connected and is not connected to the internet" as recited in independent claim 26 (emphasis added).

Since Van Der Meer fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 26, it cannot anticipate that claim. For at least similar reasons as presented above with respect to claim 26, and further in view of their own respective features, independent claims 9, 14-16 and 21 are also patentable over Van Der Meer. Furthermore, dependent claims 2, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 17, 19, 20, 22, 24 and 25 are also not anticipated by Van Der Meer for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims from which they depend and further in view of their own respective features. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6, 11, 18 and 23 under rejected 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Der Meer in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,182,113 to Narayanaswami ("Narayanaswami"). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As described above, Van Der Meer does not teach each and every feature of independent claims 9, 16, 21 and 26. Narayanaswami fails to solve the deficiencies of Van Der Meer with respect to independent claims 9, 16, 21 and 26. Claims 6, 11, 18 and

23 depend either directly or indirectly from one of independent claims 9, 16, 21 and 26 and are thus patentable for at least the same reason as their respective independent claims and further in view of their own respective features. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

KLOBA *et al.* Appl. No. 09/892,482

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

espectfull submitted,

Attorney for Applicant Registration No. 35,239

#\$\$LER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

(. (-

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20005-3934

(202) 371-2600

649258_1.DOC